



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/671,877	09/28/2000	Geoffrey Owen Blandy	AUS9-2000-0573-US1	7181

7590 12/05/2003

Duke W Yee  
Carstens Yee & Cahoon LLP  
P O Box 803334  
Dallas, TX 75380

EXAMINER
----------

TSAI, HENRY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2183

DATE MAILED: 12/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/671,877

Applicant(s)

BLANDY, GEOFFREY OWEN

Examiner

Henry W.H. Tsai

Art Unit

2183

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 September 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5,9,10,13,17,18 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3, 4, 6-8, 11, 12, 14-16, 19, 20, and 22-24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 9/28/00 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2183

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

1. The drawings are objected to because in Fig. 7, outputs from block 710 should be indicated either YES or NO . A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### *Specification*

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure

Art Unit: 2183

concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract exceeds 150 words in length. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b). Besides, in lines 18-19, it is not clear what is meant by "The calls a lookup handler for the method" since a verb is missing.

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

at page 1, line 8, all application numbers are missing; and  
at page 10, line 13, "266" should read --256--.

Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Objections***

5. Claims 6-8, 14-16, and 22-24 are objected to because of the following informalities: in claims 6 and 14, line 2, and claim 22, line 3, "the" should be deleted. Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 2183

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Karp et al. (USP 5,748,936) herein referred as Karp et al.

Referring to claim 1, Karp et al. discloses as claimed, a method of handling exceptions in a device (a computer system 20, see Fig. 1) having predication (predicate file 50 and speculative look aside table (SLAT) 80, see Fig. 3), comprising: determining if an exception is pending based on values of a predicate register pair (in the general purpose registers 36, see Col. 5, lines 9-12); and handling the exception when it is determined that an exception is pending (see Fig. 7A, in block 256 YES condition when POISON BIT is set; and also see Col. 11, lines 61-62, regarding when the poison bit is set, the processor handles the exception).

Art Unit: 2183

Referring to claim 9, Karp et al. discloses as claimed, an apparatus for handling exceptions in a device (a computer system 20, see Fig. 1) having predication (predicate file 50 and speculative look aside table (SLAT) 80, see Fig. 3), comprising: means for determining if an exception is pending based on values of a predicate register pair (in the general purpose registers 36, see Col. 5, lines 9-12); and means for handling the exception when it is determined that an exception is pending (see Fig. 7A, in block 256 YES condition when POISON BIT is set; and also see Col. 11, lines 61-62, regarding when the poison bit is set, the processor handles the exception).

Note claim 17 contains the similar limitations as claims 1 and 9 which are disclosed by Karp et al. as set forth above. Further note all the steps and means described in claims 1 and 9 are inherently implemented in a computer program as claimed.

As to claims 2, 10, and 18, Karp et al. also discloses: determining if an exception is pending includes determining if a value of a first predicate register is true (see Fig. 7A, in block 24, CONTROLLING PREDICATE is true) and a second predicate register is false (see Fig. 7A, in block 248, when LABEL of PQ (or CONTROLLING PREDICATE, see Col. 11, lines 41-43) is zero, see also Col. 11, lines 51-52).

Art Unit: 2183

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 5, 13, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karp et al. (USP 5,748,936).

Karp et al. discloses the claimed invention except for: the device having an IA64 architecture.

However, Karp et al., mentioned in col. 5, lines 13-15, that the processor 22 may vary. It is well known in the art that IA64 architecture is one of different processor architectures; and the predication and speculation (predicate file 50 and speculative look aside table (SLAT) 80, see Fig. 3), are the key features existing in an IA64 architecture.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Karp et al.'s system to comprise: the data processing device having an IA64 architecture in order to allow the Karp et al.'s system to

Art Unit: 2183

process larger operand operations for more precise calculation results.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

10. Claims 3, 4, 6-8, 11, 12, 14-16, 19, 20, and 22-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

11. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Karp et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,748,936), the closest reference, and the other cited prior art do not teach or fairly suggest:

The method wherein handling the exception includes determining if an address of an instruction within a method that threw the exception is in a try block, and if the address of the instruction is not in the try block, invoking a return associated with the method (in claims 3, 11, and 19); and

The method wherein handling the exception includes determining if the an instruction in a method that threw the exception is in a try block and invoking a snippet associated with the method (in claims 6, 14, and 22).



Art Unit: 2183

### ***Conclusion***

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure, such as Adler et al.'023; Kukol'016; and Amerson et al.'219 also disclosing the similar limitations as claimed.

### ***Contact Information***


13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Henry Tsai whose telephone number is (703) 308-7600. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner supervisor, Eddie Chan, can be reached on (703) 305-9712. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Art Unit: 2183

14. In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, Group 2100 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office actions directly into

**the Group at fax number: 703-872-9306**

This practice may be used for filing papers not requiring a fee. It may also be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify the examiner and art unit at the top of your cover sheet. Papers submitted via FAX into Group 2100 will be promptly forward to the examiner.

  
HENRY W. H. TSAI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

December 1, 2003